

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please add a replacement sheet of drawings 8/8, enclosed herewith, which includes a new Fig. 10.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, 29 and 34-52 are pending. Claims 3, 6, 8, 13, 17, 18, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28 and 30-33 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 29 are amended. Claims 34 to 52 have been added. Amended claim 1 finds basis, for example, in the original claims 1 and 6. Amendments to claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 19 are based, for example, on the original claim 6. Claim 29 is amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 30. Basis for new independent claim 34 can be found, for example, in the original claims 1 and 8. New dependent claims 35-52 and based, for example, on original claims 2-5, 7, 9-16 and 19-26 and original claim 8. Thus, no new matter has been added.

### **Drawings**

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Applicant has added a new Fig. 10, which shows an image-forming device having a plurality of mirrors. Brief Description of the Drawings and Detailed Description have been amended to include a description of Fig. 10. Fig. 10 and the associated descriptions are derived from US 5,442,414, e.g., Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 47-68, which has been incorporated by reference in the present application. Thus, no new matter has been added.

In summary, Applicant submits that the objections to the drawings have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

### **§ 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-14, 16, 19-26, 29, 31 and 33 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Handschy US 6,038,005 ("Handschy"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant has canceled claims 3, 6, 8, 13, 21, 22, 24, 25, 31 and 33, thereby rendering their rejection moot.

With regard to the remaining claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that Handschy does not teach all elements of the amended claims. For example, amended claim 1 requires that "the system of optical elements images the emitting surfaces of the light source modules onto the

entrance of the light tunnel.” In contrast, Handschy describes forming a real image of the light source(s) at a source imaging area. As it is apparent from the description and the drawings of Handschy, it does not teach or suggest that this source imaging area should be at an entrance of a light tunnel or the use of the light tunnel itself. Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, element 48 is a beam splitting cube, which is an optical element completely different in structure and purpose from a light tunnel. Therefore, claim 1, and claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 23 and 26 dependent thereon, are patentable for at least these reasons.

In addition, Handschy does not teach “a plurality of light source modules disposed in an array within a non-radially symmetrical aperture” and that “the non-radially symmetrical aperture has a long dimension and a short dimension and is oriented so that the long dimension is aligned with the pivot axis of the mirrors of the image-forming device,” as required by the amended claim 29.

The rejection of claims 1-14, 16, 19-26, 29, 31 and 33 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Handschy has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

New independent claim 34 and claims dependent thereon are also patentable over Handschy, because the reference does not teach all elements of these claims. For example, claim 1 requires that “the system of optical elements images the emitting surfaces of the light source modules onto the image-forming device.” Instead, as explained above, Handschy describes forming a real image of the light source(s) at a source imaging area, and this source imaging area is clearly different from the spatial light modulator 46.

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Applicant has canceled claims 17, 18, 27, 28 and 32, thereby rendering their rejection moot. The Applicant has also canceled claim 30, but its limitations have been incorporated into claim 29.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handschy in view of Anderson US 5,997,150 (“Anderson”). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 15 is not obvious over the cited references for the reasons presented above in connection with claim 1. In addition, the requisite motivation to combine the cited references and reasonable expectation of success are absent.

Claim 30 (now claim 29) stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handschy in view of McClelland et al. US 6,201,629 ("McClelland"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. McClelland is directed to a torsional micro-mechanical mirror system, but it does not disclose or suggest **an illumination system** wherein a plurality of light source modules is disposed within a non-radially symmetrical aperture having a long dimension and a short dimension and as further required by claim 29. Further, the requisite motivation to combine the cited references and reasonable expectation of success are absent.

The rejection of claims 15 and 30 (now 29) under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handschy in view of Anderson or McClelland has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, 29 and 34-52, as amended, at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

January 27, 2006

Date

By:



Anna A. Kobilansky, Reg. No.: 53,146

Telephone No.: 651-737-8345

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833